

**Certification under 37 CFR 1.8b**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to Fax No. (703) 872-9318 on July 1, 2003.

Brian W. Hameder  
Name

Brian W. Hameder  
Signature

DOCKET: CU-2078

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

APPLICANT: Henrik Leimand )  
SERIAL NO: 09/446,991 ) Group Art Unit: 2854  
FILED: December 30, 1999 ) Examiner: Ren Luo Yan  
TITLE: Method of Operation of a Printing Unit and Printing Unit for Offset Machine

THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 01 2003

RESPONSE

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 1, 2003 and having a shortened statutory period for reply set to expire on July 1, 2003. Applicant submits the following responsive amendment in the above-identified application. Applicant believes this response places the application in better condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, dated April 1, 2003, the Examiner states that Claims 12-22 are pending, Claims 12-20 are withdrawn from consideration, and Claims 21 and 22 are rejected.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Jahn (US 4,722,273) in view of EP 0574124. The rejection states that Jahn teaches a fluid applying unit which can apply both water and lacquer, and the '124 patent teaches replacing the fluid applying unit with a doctor blade chamber device, thus making the presently claimed invention obvious. The Applicant disagrees with this understanding of the cited references, and respectfully traverses the rejection.

The rejection first cites column 1, line 38 through column 2, line 4 of Jahn for support of the above understanding of this reference. That section discusses the prior art and states that "It is conventional to use separate lacquering units". However, from this it is certainly not clear whether a dampening unit may apply both lacquer and water. The prior art discusses the mutual use of dampening units when lacquering, and that a washing device could be converted into a lacquer applying device. However, there is no disclosure in the Jahn reference of a doctor blade chamber device applying both water and lacquer.

The rejection next cites the paragraph spanning from column 3 to column 4 of Jahn. This is where there is confusion between the washing device 11 in Jahn with the doctor blade chamber device for applying both lacquer and damp as claimed in the present application.

In this respect it should be noted that there is a difference between a washing unit as disclosed as a washing device 11, and a dampening device as disclosed by the dampening unit 7 in Jahn. It is fully agreed that Jahn does not disclose a doctor blade chamber device. The scraper blade or doctor blade 15 used in the washing device 11 could not be compared to a closed doctor blade chamber device. According to the present invention it is one device 28 which is used either to apply lacquer or used as a dampening unit (not to be confused with a washing device as disclosed as the washing device 11 of the '273).

Jahn clearly discloses that one should use both a washing device 11 and a dampening unit 7. Moreover, it is also clear that it is the washing device which could be used as a lacquering device, cf. column 4, lines 3-9.

While the washing device 11 of Jahn is able to apply both water (washing fluid) and lacquer (solvent), the purpose of this device is to wash the blanket cylinder. It does not replace the dampening unit 7 in that patent. In contrast, the doctor blade chamber device as claimed in the present application applies both water and lacquer, incorporating both the dampening unit and lacquering unit into a single device.

Furthermore, as claimed in the present application, the doctor blade chamber device remains engaged with the plate cylinder at all times when applying water or

3

lacquer. In contrast, as discussed in column 3, lines 59-64 of Jahn, the dampening unit is moved away from the plate cylinder when the washing device is applying lacquer.

Since there is no teaching or suggestion in Jahn to use the washing device, to apply both lacquer and water, to function both as a lacquering and dampening unit, and thus allowing the separate dampening unit to be removed as is possible with the claimed invention, the Applicant considers the rejection to the claims overcome.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in better condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

July 1, 2003  
Date

Brian W. Hameder  
Attorney for Applicant  
Brian W. Hameder  
c/o Ladas & Parry  
224 South Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
(312) 427-1300  
Reg. No. 45613

FAX RECEIVED  
JUL 01 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800